

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/394,230

Applicant(s)

GUNDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman.

(3) _____.

(2) Robin Chadwick.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2002.Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representativeExhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Chadwick discussed the Cantor reference and claim amendments to overcome the prior art and further clarify the invention i.e. deleting the new matter limitations of the previous amendment; adding a limitation "crosslinked double-stranded probes"; and/or adding final step "wherein the false positive is less than X per Y number of nucleotides". The examiner stated that hairpins immobilized on a substrate are in the prior art and would read on crosslinked double-stranded probes. The examiner further stated that any of the suggested amendments would require further search. Ms. Chadwick stated that she would consult with Applicant before submitting an amendment.